

REMARKS

To further prosecution of the present application, Applicants have amended herein Claims 15, 18 and 20. In addition, Applicants have added herein new Claims 21-26. New Claims 21-26 do not add subject matter to the present application and have antecedent basis, as discussed below.

Claims 15-26 are currently pending with Claims 15 and 21-26 in independent form.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Rejection of Claims 15-18 Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 15-18 have been rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. 6,123,253 issued to Mehta et al. (hereinafter "Mehta"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 15-18 for the reasons given below.

Applicants have amended herein Claim 15 directed to a one-piece mailer in order to distinguish the prior art references cited. In particular, Applicants have amended Claim 15 to include the limitation to *one or more lines of adhesive or cohesive disposed at one or more positions along the top edge of the sheet, the one or more adhesive or cohesive positions being at least one of: (i) located flush with the top edge of the sheet and (ii) located proximate to the top edge of the sheet*. The claim amendment has antecedent basis in the application specification at page 13, line 30 to page 14 line 2 and in Figs. 9-13.

Applicants respectfully submit that Mehta does not disclose at least one or more lines of adhesive or cohesive disposed either flush with the top edge of the sheet and/or proximate to the top edge of the sheet, as recited in Claim 15. As best shown in Figs. 9-13, the one or more lines of adhesive or cohesive are at least proximate to and/or flush with the top edge of the single ply sheet. Applicants have discovered that the position(s) of the one or more lines of adhesive or cohesive relative to the top edge of the sheet, which is typically the edge of the sheet that is fed into printing, folding and/or other processing equipment to form a mailer, can effect the ease with which the sheet enters and is fed into equipment, as well as can effect the overall processing. In certain instances, the position(s) of the one or more lines of adhesive or cohesive interfere with

feeding rollers such that one or more rollers contact the adhesive or cohesive and cause feeding and/or processing problems.

Mehta does not disclose one or more lines of adhesive or cohesive disposed at one or more positions along the top edge of the sheet with *the one or more adhesive or cohesive positions being at least one of: (i) located flush with the top edge of the sheet and (ii) located proximate to the top edge of the sheet.*

With respect to Figs. 1, 4, 5 and 6 of Mehta, Mehta discloses transverse adhesive pattern (58) along tear-off strip portion (46), as shown in Fig. 1; transverse adhesive pattern (93) adjacent second end (24-b), as shown in Fig. 4; transverse adhesive pattern (58-b) disposed on tear-off portions (46-b) and (52-b), as shown in Fig. 5; and transverse adhesive pattern (110) disposed on tear-off portion (46-c), as shown in Fig. 6.

With respect to the mailer shown in Fig. 1, Mehta does not disclose a particular location of the transverse adhesive pattern (58) relative to the top edge (22) of the form (10) other than it is disposed along the tear-off strip portion (46). (col. 5, lines 57-58). Fig. 1 illustrates the transverse adhesive pattern (58) is spaced from edge 22; however, Mehta does not provide any further disclosure of the position of the pattern (58) other than when the form (10) is folded into a C-fold mailer, wherein the form is folded along the first fold line 32 to bring the first panel (26) into contact with the third panel (30), adhesive patterns will contact corresponding areas of adhesive on adjacent or other panels. (col. 6, lines 26-31).

In addition, with respect to the mailer shown in Figs. 4-5, the first face includes adhesive pattern (93) and the second face includes adhesive pattern (58-b). Mehta discloses folding the form into a Z-fold mailer by folding about fold line (32-b) to bring the first and second panels (26-b) and (28-b) into contact, and by folding about fold line (34-b) to bring the second face of the third panel (30-b) into contact with the second face of the second panel (28-b). Mehta further discloses that corresponding areas of pressure seal adhesive on adjacent panels come into contact forming a seal to provide a sealed mailer. (col. 7, lines 8-16). However, other than disclosing the positions of the transverse adhesive patterns (93) and (58-b) are disposed in tear-off portions (46-b) and (52-b), Mehta does not provide any further disclose of the positions of such patterns relative to edges (22-b) and (24-b). Rather, Mehta only discloses when folding the form

(10), corresponding areas of adhesive on adjacent or other panels come into contact.

With respect to the mailer shown in Fig. 6, Mehta similarly discloses the positions of the transverse adhesive patterns (110) as disposed along tear-off portion 46-c, but does provide any further disclosure about the position of the pattern (110) relative to the top or adjacent edge 22-c. Rather, Mehta discloses the patterns (110) are positioned relative to corresponding areas of pressure seal adhesive on adjacent or other panels that contact and thereby form a seal. (col. 8, lines 32-41).

In short, Mehta does not provide any disclosure with respect to the positions of the transverse adhesive patterns (58), (93), (58-b) and (110) other than the positions of the patterns area long tear-off strips and corresponding to adhesive patterns disposed along adjacent or other panels. Thus, Mehta does not disclose the limitation of *one or more lines of adhesive or cohesive disposed at one or more positions along the top edge of the sheet, wherein the one or more adhesive or cohesive positions are at least one of: (i) located flush with the top edge of the sheet and (ii) located proximate to the top edge of the sheet.*

For at least this reason, Claim 15 is patentably distinguishable from Mehta. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 15 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(a).

Claims 16-20 depend from Claim 15 and are patentable for at least the same reasons given above. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 16-20.

Rejection of Claims 19 and 20 Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 193(a)

Claims 19 and 20 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Mehta, as applied to Claims 15-18, and in further view of U.S. 6103,355 issued to Mehta (hereinafter “the ‘355 patent”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 19 and 20.

Claims 19 and 20 depend from Claim 15 and are patentable for at least the reasons given above with respect to Claim 15. Mehta in combination with the ‘355 patent does not disclose at least the limitation discussed above with reference to Claim 15.

Therefore, Claims 19 and 20 are patentably distinguishable over the cited combination. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Patentability of New Claims

New Claims 21-26 are patentably distinguishable over Mehta, and the cited combination of Mehta and the '355 patent. Each of Claims 21-26 includes the limitation to *one or more lines of adhesive or cohesive disposed at one or more positions along the top edge of the sheet, the one or more adhesive or cohesive positions being at least one of: (i) located flush with the top edge of the sheet and (ii) located proximate to the top edge of the sheet*. Therefore, Claims 21-26 are patentable for at least the reasons given above with respect to this limitation as recited in Claim 15.

In addition, Claims 22-23 further recite the limitation of *a translucent area disposed along a first panel section defined between the top edge and a first fold line*. Mehta, either alone or in combination with the '355 patent, does not disclose this limitation of a translucent area disposed in a panel section between a top edge and a first fold line.

Further, Claim 24 further recites a limitation of *a continuous line of adhesive or cohesive disposed longitudinally along each of the first and second marginal strips extending along each of the three panel sections*. Mehta, alone or in combination with the '355 patent, does not disclose this limitation; rather, the prior art patents disclose patterns of adhesive rather than continuous lines of adhesive extending along the three panels of a form.

With respect to Claims 25 and 26, Claims 25 and 26 recite the limitation of *a return envelope disposed along a panel section defined between the bottom edge of the sheet and a fold line, the return envelope including a suitably sized single-ply of paper*. Claim 25 further recites the limitation of *the single-ply of paper disposed between the first and second side edges along the third panel and adhered to the third panel by one or more longitudinal lines of adhesive or cohesive located between and adjacent lines of weakening and one or more lines of adhesive or cohesive located along the bottom edge of the sheet*. Mehta discloses a return envelope, as shown in Fig. 8; however, the first ply


160 forming the envelope is not adhered to the form along a third panel section of three sections, but between two separate panel sections (140) and (150).

Claim 26 further recites the limitation of *the single-ply of paper disposed between the lines of weakening along the third panel and adhered to the third panel by one or more longitudinal lines of adhesive or cohesive located between and adjacent lines of weakening and one or more lines of adhesive or cohesive located along the bottom edge of the sheet*. As discussed above with respect to Claim 25, Mehta discloses the return envelope (160) shown in Fig. 8 as adhered between two separate panel sections (140) and (150).

For at least the reasons given above, Claims 21-26 are patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art patents.

Based upon the foregoing amendments and discussion, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this response, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Carol H. Peters

Registration No. 45,010
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS
GLOVSKY and POPEO, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant
One Financial Center
Boston, Massachusetts 02111
Telephone: 617/348-4914
Facsimile: 617/542-2241
email: chpeters@mintz.com

Date: April 26, 2006

TRA 2146277v.1